

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 28, 2008, claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kramer (EP 0 929 028) in view of Miyasaka et al. (EP 1 396 812) and further in view of Gordon et al. (US 6,995,748). In addition, claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kramer in view of Miyasaka et al. and further in view of Miller et al. (U.S. 5,841,078).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 6 and 10 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Applicants have also canceled claim 12 and have added new claims 16-21. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1, 6 and 10 are not obvious in view of the cited references of Kramer, Miyasaka et al. and Gordon et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-11 and 13-21 be allowed.

### I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 6 and 10

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites “*wherein a sampling resolution of the sensing surface is based on at least one of periodically sampling alternating pixels in the pressure sensor array such that sampled pixels are distributed in a periodic pattern throughout the pressure sensor array and monitoring at least one of a plurality of zones in the pressure sensor array,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Kramer, Miyasaka et al. and Gordon et al. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of these cited references, and request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The Office Action on page 4 states that the cited reference of Gordon et al. “teach in col. 4, lines 50-56 where a single pixel is sampled periodically to detect movement, and in col. 4, lines 25-44 where more than one pixel but not all of the pixels are sampled periodically to detect movement.” However, the cited reference of Gordon et al. does not disclose the distribution of these “more than one pixel” throughout an array. Consequently, the cited reference of Gordon et al. does not

disclose “*periodically sampling alternating pixels in the pressure sensor array such that sampled pixels are distributed in a periodic pattern throughout the pressure sensor array,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Kramer, Miyasaka et al. and Gordon et al.

In addition, the Office Action on page 3 states that the cited reference of Miyasaka et al. discloses “monitoring at least one of a plurality of zones in an array (Fig. 2a and & 2b).” However, Figs. 2A and 2B of Miyasaka et al. and associated passage in Miyasaka et al. illustrate and describe minutiae points or portions of a fingerprint image, not zones in a pressure sensor array. Thus, the cited reference of Miyasaka et al. does not disclose “*monitoring at least one of a plurality of zones in the pressure sensor array,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1, which further supports the conclusion that the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Kramer, Miyasaka et al. and Gordon et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 6 and 10, which recite limitations similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claims 6 and 10 are also not obvious in view of the cited references of Kramer, Miyasaka et al. and Gordon et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claims 6 and 10 be allowed as well.

## II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11 and 13-21

Each of the dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11 and 13-21 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 6 and 10. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Safai et al.

Date: April 28, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300